DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 359 CS 214 363

AUTHOR Dominquez B., Elias
TITLE "Que lo diga a los cuatro vientos": An Ethnographic Analysis of Three Sermons by Priests of Mexican Origin.
PUB DATE Mar 94
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (45th, Nashville, TN, March 16-19, 1994). M.A. Essay, University of Illinois.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Audience Awareness; Comparative Analysis; *Cultural Context; Ethnography; Higher Education; *Language Role; *Persuasive Discourse; *Religious Factors; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Communicator Style; Discourse Communities; Illinois (Chicago); Mexico; *Rhetorical Strategies; Sermons; Textual Analysis

ABSTRACT

Noting that many instructors involved in teaching writing to students of differing cultural backgrounds seek to pinpoint the origin of the differences in communication between the form of written language conveyed to students and that which they use in their everyday language, this paper recommends ethnography to provide evidence as to what is valued and considered skillful use of language in different cultures. As ethnographic research, the paper analyzes verbal "performance" (e.g., sermons) directed at the Mexican Catholic community in Chicago. According to the paper, the sermons chosen for comparative analysis show rhetorical effectiveness and cultural rapport with the audience. The paper examines in detail three different sermons (delivered by three different priests) both for communicative norms and as literary texts. Based on Dell Hymes' "Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach" and the help of two interpretive consultants, the paper concludes that Hymes' components of communication combine to create successful speech events out of the sermons examined. The paper calls for further research into the norms of interpretation and interaction of different speech communities to understand what plays a role in the evaluation of the way people communicate and the outcome of such evaluations so that some of the gaps in communication that still exist between cultural groups (especially in the educational system) can be bridged. Contains seven notes and six references; texts of the sermons are attached. (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 371 359

"Que lo diga a los cuatro vientos": An Ethnographic Analysis of Three Sermons by Priests of Mexican Origin

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Dominguez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Elias Dominguez B.
University of IL at Chicago
Qualifying Essay for the Master's Degree in English

CS211363

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction and Rationale

Some of the questions that assail many composition instructors, and perhaps teachers in general, in regard to their students from diverse cultural backgrounds is how to "reach" them. That is, many instructors have the inkling that when they are teaching students from other than traditional European-American cultural backgrounds, the students present written and verbal attempts at communication that are not altogether familiar or "standard," nor are they altogether devoid of a method and logic. As Labov perceived and confirmed that there was a logical--not denigrating--basis for the linguistic differences between the vernacular speech of African-American inner-city youths and that of "standard" English speakers, so do many of us who are or have been involved in the teaching of writing to students of differing cultural backgrounds perceive and seek to pinpoint the origin of the differences in communication between the form of written language, or register, that we try to convey to our students and that which they use in their everyday speech and in which they demonstrate a considerable degree of mastery.

The questions that loom before us, however, seem at best vague and often unmanageable. That is, how does one get the reticent student--who appears only so because she or he feels intimidated by the language and conventions of the speech used in the classroom--to participate? How does one, first of all, *recognize*

that the student in question possesses linguistic abilities or skills that we, because of our training or familiarity with the register we seek to impart, are blind to, or do not value, and therefore reject indiscriminately, much to the detriment of the student's education and self-esteem? Better yet, what other forms of expression are valued and used by the students who do not subscribe to the "standard" English register? Can we, in the classroom, recognize value in forms of communication that do not reflect "standard" form? These are some of the questions that surface when we begin to examine diverse cultural forms of communication. The study of ethnography, when carried out properly, provides us with some evidence as to what is valued and considered skillful use of language in different cultures. By identifying some of these criteria, we as instructors can use the information to generate new approaches to teaching that will allow us to "reach" or at least serve our students better.

It is this interest that has impelled me to pursue ethnographic research. In particular, I chose to conduct a micro-ethnographic study/analysis of a verbal "performance"[1] directed at the Mexican community in Chicago in order to experience how ethnography may provide some answers to the type of questions posed above. When I began this analysis, I sought to train myself in the field of ethnography while providing information that might prove useful in bettering educational processes for the Mexican community. This is a very rudimentary example of the information that ethnographic studies may present, but I believe that as I develop a talent and gain skills for this type of study, I will be able to expand on many of the

2

ideas here presented in order to make the effort involved in research beneficial to everyone.

Hence, I am able to say that the purpose of analyzing sermons directed at the Mexican community in the Chicago area is to uncover some of the aspects which constitute communicative competence, or verbal mastery--which in turn reflects what is valued in terms of linguistic skills--for this cultural group. The growing Hispanic population[2], of which the Mexican group constitutes the majority suggests that we need to examine the communicative background of this cultural group in order to better respond to its needs, ensure successful communication, and to allow the members of this group to better incorporate themselves into mainstream society. Because the focus on the Catholic religion appears to be a common element in the life of many of the members of this community, the sermon, as it is carried out in the Catholic church, appears as one of the few public *speech event*s, or particular speeches within a speech situation (e.g., the celebration of the mass in this case), that are conducted in the cultural group's native language on a weekly basis, and the message of which is shared by large representative groups of the community. I consider that the sermons, by virtue of their prominence as public *speech event*s, are a good source from which to gather information about the social aspects of communicative components for this community.

After recording five sermons in Catholic churches in the Chicago area, I chose three sermons for a comparative analysis. The reason for choosing these particular three is that in my judgment they pose interesting and elucidating points of comparison in

rhetorical effectiveness and cultural rapport with the audience. The *performers*, or deliverers of the *speech event*, were of the same ethnic background as most of the congregation (i.e. Mexican). For the sake of brevity and since it is not the object of this analysis to either praise or denigrate any one particular individual's verbal skill, I will use the pseudonyms of Antonio, Jorge, and Carlos to refer to the performers.

Background

Priest Antonio is the pastor of a church on the west side of Chicago where he delivered his sermon in November of 1992. Priest Jorge was acting as a visiting priest from Mexico when he delivered his sermon at a different church also on the west side of Chicago in September of the same year. Priest Carlos' sermon was televised on a local Spanish-language channel in October of 1992. The neighborhood known as Little Village became my main geographic area of focus because the churches are situated there and it is also one of the larger Hispanic neighborhoods in Chicago, which would allow us to presume that most of the audience for priest Carlos' sermon would also come from this part of the city.

Little Village is comprised of a predominantly Hispanic population. Although many of the residents there are Mexican-American, or Chicanos, there are still many residents who are not bilingual. This appears not to be the only reason for the celebration of masses in Spanish, for even some of those residents who do speak

English sometimes prefer to attend the masses celebrated in Spanish. I also attended masses celebrated in English at these two churches and noticed that the congregation was comparable in number to that of the masses celebrated in Spanish, and that the congregation was also predominantly Hispanic.

Even though most of my comments concerning the sermons here analyzed are based solely on my judgement, which I believe is justified to a certain degree by virtue of being a member of this cultural group, I conducted a few interviews which helped me in the analysis of the sermons. I will refer to the people I interviewed by their first names: Gloria, Apolinar, and Alicia. Gloria and Apolinar are married and are active participants in their parish. All three consultants are originally from Michoacán, Mexico, but although they have resided in the U.S. for almost twenty years their bilingual ability remains rudimentary; hence their preference for masses celebrated in Spanish. The age of all three consultants ranges form 50 to 60, with Gloria being the youngest.

Methodology

I applied the comments and observations obtained from these consultants to the sermons in order to help me explore some of the expected *communicative norms* to which the sermons were supposed to adhere, and to offset the domination of one particular interpretive perspective. I found that by using the *components of communication*, proposed by Hymes in Foundations for Sociolinguistics, I was able to

conduct a better analysis of the sermons than by focusing solely on literary methods of analysis in which I have, at this point, received most of my training. I, nevertheless, do examine the sermon as a literary text at times in order to expose the tacit cultural bonds upon which the sermons rely; as a result this work is a combination of literary and ethnographic analysis. Finnegan's Oral Tradition and the Verbal Arts provided questions which furthered my analysis. Briggs' Learning How to Ask helped me pinpoint matters of concern and helped me with the structure of the analysis. Tannen's Talking Voices alerted me to the role of repetition and imagery in discourse. In regard to quantitative analysis, I limited myself to the measuring of pauses (silence) to determine whether the silence was used for rhetorical effect or to delineate "sections" (i.e., what we would perceive as paragraphs in a written text) of the oral performance.

I include the transcriptions and translations of the sermons in the appendix. The transcriptions include line numbering on the right side of the pages in order to facilitate points of comparison in the translation. For the key[3] to the transcription see the Appendix. I divided the analysis into five foci, which are meant to elucidate points of comparison between the sermons rather than to offer an exhaustive study of each element and its function within the sermon. In this analysis I fused a literary critical approach of textual analysis to an ethnographic one because I perceive this kind of study to be open to a multi-disciplinary approach, which in my opinion enhances and strengthens the arguments which may be presented. In regard to the foci, I considered that it was essential to provide information about (1) the audience, so that the pertinence of the use of language

and references could be either gauged or clarified or both; focus (2), the message content, is primarily a manifestation of textual analysis but it also renders the information which connects my analysis to ethnography (i.e., the cultural peculiarities); focus (3), form and key (which can be loosely understood as the genre and tone chosen for the communicative attempt), allowed me to present the rhetorical aspects (i.e., use of oratorical devices and conventions) of the performance that in my judgement evidenced an effect on the audience. The norms of interpretation and interaction are foci (4) and (5) respectively, and I considered them separately to illustrate the difference between the elements pertinent to each, even though in practice they may appear to bleed into each other. As the names suggest, norms of interpretation and interaction are "rules" that allow the listeners of the speech event to understand the speech at different levels or in different ways, and to behave or respond as may be deemed appropriate by that understanding and the setting in which the listeners may find themselves.

Analysis

Focus: Audience (Addressee)

Priest Antonio apparently identified his audience as being composed mainly of rural Mexican immigrants who had spent enough time in the U.S. for them to have a certain familiarity with some eminent figures in U.S. culture and be informed about current events; we see this from his reference to political figures and recent

(at that time) news articles during the performance of the sermon (lns. 61-65). Priest Jorge, who had just arrived from Mexico and was referred to as a "visiting priest," considered his audience Mexican immigrants, but did not consider them necessarily provincial in thinking nor economically disadvantaged--an association that is frequently made in regard to Mexican immigrants. Priest Jorge's recurring reference to wealth and social drives makes evident his assumption of the audience. Priest Carlos appears to direct his sermon to the Chicano population of the U.S. because the mass he celebrated exhibited various occasions in which code-switching (in this case between English and Spanish) was performed, which suggests that the audience was considered bilingual, and the national broadcasting of the celebration of the mass through television also denotes an awareness of a vast and dispersed audience.

Focus: Message Content

Priest Antonio, in particular, shows us how knowledge, or accurate perception, of the audience and its background ensured the communicative success of one of his *speech acts*: the story of a tribe that sought the promise of a prosperous future. If we look at Priest Antonio's story (lns. 25-57) we notice that the setting is rural instead of urban, and that the geographic setting is a mountainous region instead of the plains. The reference to a tribe in a rural area rather than to a particular family in an urban setting, accentuates the congregation's (audience's) familiarity with the life in the "rancho," which, aside from "ranch," can also refer to a small community on the outskirts of a town. The reference to a tribal group makes manifest

the cultural bond between the speaker and the audience by recalling their pre-Columbian heritage, and the communal element of such a social group recalls the setting of the rancho which most of the congregation can recognize, if not identify with.

The mountainous region used as the setting of the story reflects the landscape of much of Mexico--rather than the plains of the central U.S.--which the addressees would identify readily because of the prominence of the geographical imagery. Priest Antonio skillfully connects the theme of the rather pagan setting to that of the Judeo-Christian religious tradition by using the motif of the promised land (ln. 51). The descent from the mountain of one of the future tribe leaders bearing the vision of a prosperous future for the tribe, recalls for us the Biblical story of Moses' descent from Mount Sinai with the stone tablets bearing the ten commandments and the promise of a new covenant. The scriptural allusion successfully retrieves the attention of the congregation to the purpose of the *speech situation* (i.e., confirmation of religious dogma), and the attention is then directed toward the subject of the *speech event*: the reason for celebrating All Saints Day.

In Priest Carlos' sermon we see the opposite tactic when trying to involve the congregation; Priest Carlos does not attract the congregation through subliminal identification, but instead tries to do it directly by overtly asking the congregation if they can think of people who resemble the characters he refers to in his sermons (lns. 2-3,17). He did not receive a verbal response from his audience, but this does not mean that his tactic was ineffective, for there are other reasons why the audience may not have spoken, and I present some

of them below when I speak of a similar situation in Priest Antonio's sermon.

Focus: Form and Key

Priest Jorge's sermon appears persuasive because of its appeal to authority and its *key*, which can be loosely understood as tone, manner, or spirit in which the speech act is rendered (Hymes 57). Whereas Priest Antonio refers to religious authority (including scriptures) very little and restricts himself to the gospel read that day, Priest Jorge uses the appeal to authority extensively. By combining appeal to authority, "subrosa argumentation" (i.e., indirect form of arguing so as to avoid personal confrontation; see Briggs 82), and authoritative *key*, Priest Jorge gives a forceful sermon. We see that Priest Jorge's appeals to authority (his reference to the prophet Aaron, passages from scripture, a theological document, Pope Paul VI, and another priest) are introduced most of the time with normal stress. Higher stress on certain words, however, combines with repetition and parallelism to accentuate the force of the sermon (lns. 12-13,21-24,30-40,47-59,73-78) (Tannen 20). Priest Carlos initially makes use of marked stress (effective especially in ln. 20) combined with repetition to convey emphasis, but the sermon becomes rather passive when he uses the word "ojalá" [hopefully] seven times in the twenty lines which are structurally the heart of the sermon (lns. 25-45). As a result of the change, the exhortation at the end of the sermon lacks force, and the reference to "tarea" [chore or homework] appears to lack authoritative energy behind it. Priest Jorge, on the other hand, continues to cultivate an accusative key even near the

end of his sermon by calling into question the degree of vanity and materialism in the members of the congregation, and he combines it with the authoritative key he has been employing all along to give the oral performance a strong rhetorical effect.

Conversely, Priest Antonio makes less use of rising and falling intonation and stress but does use repetition and pauses to create emphasis and rhetorical effect. One particular case in which we see Priest Antonio's effective use of silence is in his telling of the tribal story. Priest Antonio's notion of pausing as an oratorical device is illustrated in these lines because the pauses maintain interest by building suspense. That is, in the story the three sons of the tribal chief return from a trek with different types of gifts for their dying father. We relatively quickly learn about the gifts the first two sons bring, and even though the gifts are not overtly belittled (but rather the contrary), the brevity with which they are considered transmits their dismissal. When the third son enters the story, however, Priest Antonio uses silence at crucial points to intensify interest and imagery (lns. 44-47):

> And then the third son arrives and arrives empty-
> handed and says to the dad, "Dad, I did not bring you
> anything but when I was at the summit of the mountain...
> I had a vision...."

We can see from the story Priest Antonio tells that the use of imagery is very important to evoke recognition and retain attention. If we agree that the performer of this *speech event* relies primarily

on the use of language (as opposed to physical gestures, garb, and props) to retain his audience's attention and interest, we have to recognize that the use of imagery can be a very effective tool in conveying messages and focusing attention (Tannen 135).

And it is the attention of the audience that Priest Jorge also attracts and directs through his effective use of imagery. For an example of Priest Jorge's effort we can look at his description of wealthy men (lns. 26-38). Priest Jorge's assertion that wealth imprisons instead of liberates is effectively conveyed by the image of a person traveling in a car and only seeing life through a window. The window of the car, in Priest Jorge's sermon, establishes the rich person as the one who is separated from the people who actually make up the world seen through it. Looking out through a window evokes the idea of security, but also one of confinement because the purpose of the window is defined by a closed area rather than an open one. By making reference to a person who will "never touch, feel, and experience" life (ln. 33), Priest Jorge confirms the idea of confinement that the image suggests, and this is the concept impressed on the listener.

Priest Carlos also begins his sermon with the use of imagery. He, however, relies on imagery already formulated: the Biblical images of Moses raising his hand and being helped by his friends to maintain them raised. Priest Carlos then applies this image to the idea of friends and relatives offering support to every individual, but he does not situate the action with particular images. He tries to extend the idea of support later in his sermon but remains ambiguous in the allusions he makes: "what is occurring in our lives"

ln. 28; "so that we can defeat the bad that exists in our society" ln. 31; "amidst all this that is occurring" ln. 35; "we are headstrong in our religion--but not in our faith, and there is a difference" (but he did not state what the difference was) ln. 38. This lack of specificity leaves the sermon abstract as opposed to those of the other priests, however, the difference makes manifest merely a difference in style, for the listeners may supply their own examples and in that way make Priest Carlos' comments specific even if not homogeneous. More importantly, this difference in style alerts us to the possibility of regional differences being at the root of, and giving rise to, the appreciation of these different styles, and which further behoove us to learn of those differences in order to better our teaching and appreciation of the tactics employed by beginning writers of diverse cultural backgrounds.

Focus: Norms of Interpretation

Priest Antonio's creative ability also comes through in the use of humor. The use of humor makes the differences more evident (in terms of the sermon) between Priest Antonio and Priest Jorge. Priest Antonio not only incorporates the use of a prop (the magnifying glass) to poke fun at the idea he is trying to counter (i.e., the belief that saints are hard to find), but he also changes *register* to further the joke. At one point (line 78), Priest Antonio changes the *key* of his speech to affirm that he has switched *register*: from that of priest to that of joker. The *key* he assumes is appropriate for a joke: conversational, familial (as seen in the use of diminutives), and ironic. When Priest Antonio asks the congregation if he has found a

"not very saintly little saint" in the young man he is looking at through the magnifying glass, the audience not only recognizes the irony but also responds to the cultural attitudes toward gender. Had Priest Antonio made such a comment about the young woman, more than eyebrows would have been raised. But the comment is comical when applied to the young man because the roguish behavior of a young male is culturally condoned, if not sanctioned.

Priest Jorge, however, sought to transmit a sermon which was more serious and confrontational (in the word's mildest sense). Priest Jorge conveys the sense of differentiation between his expectations and what he says he has noticed in the congregation's behavior, not only with words but also through proxemics. One aspect in the *mode of interpretation* regarding Priest Jorge and Priest Antonio reflects an antithetical approach. Where we have Priest Jorge standing at the altar of the church, behind the rostrum, and admonishing the congregation, we have Priest Antonio standing in the middle of the church, amidst the congregation, using humor. The lack of distance observed between Priest Antonio and the congregation affirms the cultural appreciation of proximity and light touching to convey amicability or receptiveness.

The contrast in styles between these two priests, however, appears to reflect what I perceive as a micro-cultural phenomenon that rests on the regional differences of the socio-cultural groups in question. That is, the priest whose style appears less formal and aloof is also the the priest who has settled amidst the community of immigrants (i.e., Priest Antonio); whereas, the priest whose style borders on being pugnacious is a "visitor" or an outsider of the

immigrant (micro-cultural) group, even if not of the larger cultural group. So what we quite plausibly see at the base of the differing styles is a manifestation of differing cultural expectations. On the one hand, Priest Antonio does not appear to employ criticism of his audience to goad them into action because he apparently wants the audience to *identify* with him, each other, and their religious role-models; he, therefore, uses humor, cultural iconography, and an amiable *key* to call his audience to unity through identification and understanding between speaker and audience. Priest Jorge on the other hand, calls into question the spirit of unity harbored by the congregation because he continually asserts the negative elements of the congregation and makes reference to his negative experiences as a *visitor* in that community. What is illustrative of this message is Priest Jorge's claim that most immigrants are driven by the desire for material gain at the expense of their spiritual and ethical well-being. As a result his sermon confirms his "outsiderness" rather than his identification with the congregation.

What I basically seek to express here is that the styles employed by the priests reflect attitudes that betray particular understandings of the social elements that give rise to the micro-cultural group (i.e., the Mexican immi-grants) they address in their sermons. Priest Antonio, by virtue of speaking in the first person plural voice, makes himself part of the group he addresses, and thus appears welcoming, uncritical, and understanding. Priest Jorge makes evident his lack of identification with the audience by reducing its motives for migration to very simple elements and condemning it for them; what becomes clear in his attitude toward

the immigrant group is that he holds a shallow understanding of his audience; an understanding that most probably rises out of culturally regional and--because we are dealing with human beings--personal expectations of who this audience is and what values and behavior should govern it.

We may say that Priest Jorge's conviction in his views gives his sermon the energy and force that is transmitted, but the use of so much force makes his sermon run the risk of having its *key* verge on accusation, rather than on exhortation, of the congregation's spiritualism (as opposed to materialism).[4] The subtle differentiation of how a message's force is interpreted is exemplified by Briggs' reference to subrosa argumentation, in which the speaker does not directly make accusations but manipulates allusions in order to avoid personal confrontation.

This point also surfaced in the interviews because Alicia and Gloria agreed that a good sermon should be forceful, and that it could--as Gloria said--"say to the four winds" [openly] whatever faults the priest was condemning in his audience. Gloria, however, later objected to the priests' pounding on the rostrum to emphasize a point because it made the sermon sound as if "they [the priests] tell it to you with anger." I propose that Gloria's objection to the sermon with "anger" rather than "force" refers to the notion that an accusation with anger carries with it direct personal antagonism instead of an impassioned message for individual betterment based on familiarity.[5]

Another element that may evoke dissent is the use of humor. The use of humor may not always be seen as appropriate in this

speech situation (i.e., the mass). One reason may be that the addressee may perceive the *speech situation*, and by extension the *speech event* (i.e., the sermon), as--in Finnegan's terms--a differentiated occasion. That is, in this scenario the *speech event* is part of a "heightened occasion," as Finnegan says, which is "set apart from the 'everyday'" (101). Gloria objected to the use of humor in this kind of *speech event*. She reasoned that it was distracting. The humor replaced the idea of the gospel in her mind. In other words, the use of humor removed her from the "heightened" setting the *speech situation* was supposed to be, according to her understanding or expectation.

The use of humor by the priest delivering the sermon, apparently, deviates from the "script" of the ritual, according to Gloria. Gloria's expectations of the conduct exemplified by the priest reveal that she has a definite notion of what is appropriate and inappropriate in this *speech situation*, which in turn is most probably culturally determined. The delineation of the genres, which may be seen as appropriate for this *speech situation* and *event*, is important because it prevents the misconstruction of the messages conveyed; therefore the study of genres expected, appropriate, or allowed within specific *speech situations* merits further study.

Focus: Norms of Interaction

The delineation of genres available, then, establishes one aspect of the *mode of interaction* in regard to the *speech event*. An example of where one aspect of the *mode of interaction* is ambiguous is the question Priest Antonio poses to the congregation (ln. 73). When

Priest Antonio asks whether there were any saints among the congregation, he does not get a single response. I, myself, had an answer which I did not voice because I didn't expect Priest Antonio to literally mean that he wanted us to answer it. That is, I first perceived his question as a rhetorical one, as the congregation listening to Priest Carlos' sermon may have done in regard to his questions.

Upon examination I realized why I responded that way. One inherent aspect of the *mode of interaction* in that *speech situation* and *event* placed me in a state of ambivalence. On the one hand I wanted to answer because Priest Antonio had directly involved me in the sermon, but on the other I hesitated to speak aloud because I was brought up with the stern guidance that "one is supposed to whisper in church" and that "one should never interrupt an elder" (because an elder is wiser). Priest Antonio, in his role as priest, is often referred to as "father." The reference to him as "father" immediately placed him, in my mind, in the role of the elder who should not be interrupted when speaking, and who had the wiser answer. As a result I perceived his question as necessarily rhetorical because, if I did not, answering would force me to violate the *norms of interaction* which had been established for the *speech situation* and *event* during my upbringing.

The lack of knowledge in regard to *norms of interpretation* may be detrimental to the authority figure in some cases. For an example we can look to the similar gestures between a Mexican boy and an inner-city African-American boy when both are being scolded. We notice that they may both tilt their head slightly

downward and to the side, the gaze on the ground or to the side, and their body is at a slight angle to the person doing the scolding. The Mexican child, however, is very likely expressing assent, whereas the African-American child is very likely about to deliver a blow.[6] This example is in no way presented to affirm or prolong stereotypes, but it is simply presented as a concrete example of how *norms of interpretation* differ from culture to culture and how those *norms* cannot be arbitrarily assumed--something which behooves us as instructors to be aware of.

Implications

The importance of the *mode of interaction* in oral performance may have academic repercussions in the sense that if a teacher places students in this state of ambivalence without being aware of it, the students' hesitation, or lack of responsiveness, may be seen as either shyness or unco-operativeness. The expectation of the fulfillment of a role may also prove to be a point of hindrance. Just as Gloria expected the priest to fulfill his role and convey the sermon within the boundaries of certain genres, so could a student expect a teacher to follow a certain role. For example, very often in Mexico the teacher is seen as an authority figure who can very well assume the role of the disciplining parent in regard to the pupil. The parents of most children would make this cultural assumption, and consequently so would the children. Transferring the child to a scenario where the teacher does not assume a stern enough role to

replace the authority of the parent, for whom he/she is supposedly substituting, would very likely direct the student to misbehave or simply misinterpret communicative patterns.

In regard to some of the comments I received from Gloria and Alicia, I suspect that such differences in *norms of interaction and interpretation* were noticed by these two consultants and seen as negative. Gloria said that she confronted the Italian priest of her church once because it appeared that he celebrated the Spanish-mass "more by force than by desire." Alicia said that she felt that Mexican priests had a "stronger sense, or feeling for their religion." These two comments could not be explained further by the consultants, but interestingly enough the two observations rested on the deliverance of the sermon as opposed to the content. Gloria and Alicia said a good sermon should be forceful and direct. Hence, it would be logical to expect them to respond favorably to stronger stress, serious tone, some gestures, and general signs of authority (e.g. pacing, stern gaze, demands, etc.). All these aspects of communication can combine to give the addressee the notion of whether the *key* of a *speech event* is either perfunctory or passionate.

Apolinar added that for a sermon to be successful, in his opinion, it had to deal with "real life--the life we are living." Apolinar apparently recognized sermons as interpretations of the gospel in application to actual lifestyles. This is interesting because this attitude suggests an idea of the sermon as being a lecture which elucidates the application of determined maxims to everyday processes. In other words, we recognize in Apolinar's comment the same attitude many of us have taken toward education at one point

or another and which is illustrated by the comments: "Why do I need to take this course? What does this course have to do with my life?" Hence, Apolinar, it could be said, listens to sermons with a critical ear to a certain extent.[7]

Another interesting element that surfaces from this observation is that many Mexican women devote much of their time for reading to religious texts. It would be interesting to learn what genre of literature these texts are most associated with (e.g., self-improvement guides, philosophical tracts, conflict resolution models) to see whether the reading of this material is executed more for a practical sense or for aesthetic pleasure (i.e., in the appreciation of the tales, the poetry, tradition, etc.), or a combination of both, and once that is determined, patterns of scholastic instruction can be developed to support, enhance, and expand this culturally embedded literacy pattern. Like Apolinar, Alicia also liked the inclusion of modern day examples of the effects of religion, but apparently focused considerably on the aesthetic elements that accompanied those examples, for she said that she "in particular liked to hear how religion affected the priests' personal life." That is, Alicia enjoyed a sermon that included the personal experiences of the priest as a result of his vocation (e.g., geographical areas he had visited, what led him to become a priest, family history, etc.).

Conclusion

We have seen that Priest Jorge and Priest Antonio definitely deal with dogmatic matters of the Catholic faith and successfully transpose them to quotidian concerns. Priest Carlos' sermon appears to lack the definite transition because it lacks definite referential images; however, his use of abstract references to quite plausibly involve the audience by making them responsible for the concrete details leaves this point open to debate. More importantly, however, is the ability to see how Hymes' *components of communication* combine to create successful *speech event*s out of the sermons here examined. It was interesting to discover, with the help of the consultants' guidance, that I, as a member of this cultural group, shared in the subconscious evaluation of the communicative components that constituted the sermons. By further researching the *norms of interpretation and interaction* of different speech communities, we can understand what plays a role in the evaluation of the way people communicate and the outcome of such evaluations (as we saw with Gloria and Alicia in regard to the priests who were not Mexican). By learning more about those norms we can bridge some of the gaps in communication that still exist between the cultural groups that comprise the country and come in close contact in our educational systems.

Appendix

This is the key for the transcriptions:

Paragraph indentation: pause of about 1 to 2 seconds.
Double space between words: pause of about .5 to 1 second.
Period (.): terminal intonation fall.
Comma: marker for micro-second pauses.
Quotation Marks: markers for reported speech.
Standard (roman) type: ordinary volume and intonation of dramatic and projected speech (e.g. public speaking).
Capitals (in bold font): increased stress.
Brackets ([ ]): transcriber's clarification.
Braces ({ }): clarification of metalinguistic elements .
Dash: denotes abrupt brake in speech so as to insert or change a thought.

NOTES

1 Bauman's definition of performance is appropriate and manageable for my purposes here. As he says, performance can be identified as a way of speaking which essentially assumes a "responsibility to an audience for a display of communicative skill, highlighting the way in which communication is carried out, above and beyond its referential content" (3).

2 U.S. 1980 census revealed a total Hispanic population of 635,602 in Illinois, of which 408,325 were of Mexican origin. See: Almanac of the 50 States; edited by Edith R. Hornor.

3 The key of the transcription was modeled after Titon's transcription of Rev. Sherfey's sermon (see Finnegan 205).

4 In support of this observation, I noticed that the pastor of the church, once Priest Jorge had finished, addressed the congregation with a comment pertaining to everyone's right to express individual opinions and how Priest Jorge had done just that.

5 Profanity in English are often recognized as "fighting words" but the use of profane words between intimate friends and directed at each other are never construed or understood as fighting words (e.g., "You old son of a bitch" when uttered between friends is not a call for confrontation). The key in which the words are delivered is very important as well as the relationship established (i.e., the degree of intimacy). I think that Gloria attempts to make a similar kind of connection when she distinguishes between a forceful sermon and one the conveys anger.

6 I worked in a youth club on the west-side of Chicago at which I came in contact with inner-city African-American children and noticed this similarity in gesture and difference in outcome. This observation was later supported by the information related by a social worker, who was interviewed in a documentary dealing with the topic of gangs in Los Angeles.

7 Apolinar, incidentally, is a minister of communion at his parish, which means that he undertook an eight class course in matters dealing with theology and received a certificate that authorized him to serve in that capacity. Therefore, his concept of the church may be more analytical than it may, at simple glance, be thought.

WORKS CITED

Bauman, Richard. Story, performance, and event. N.Y.: Cambridge U.P. 1986.

Briggs, Charles L. Learning How to Ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research. N.Y.: Cambridge U.P. 1986.

Finnegan, Ruth. Oral Traditions and the Verbal Arts: A Guide to Research Practices. London: Routledge. 1992.

Hornor, Edith R. Almanac of the 50 States: Basic Data Profiles with Comparative Tables. Palo Alto: Information Publications. 1990.

Hymes, Dell. Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach. Pennsylvania: U. of Pennsylvania Press. 1974.

Tannen, Deborah. Talking Voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse. New York: Cambridge U.P. 1989.

Nov. 1, 1992
St. ***** Church
Priest "Antonio"

We arrive at the feast of All Saints. At this feaST, as you have heard in the first reading, we remember all those persons, throughout all the ages, throughout all the times, all those persons that are the Saints of God. And that have gone through the great persecution, says the first reading, and that have washed their white clothes with the blood of Christ, and that He has now seated at His right. We celebrate this feAST because--as the first reading says-- "They are so many that nobody can count them." INfinity, millions of persons of all races, Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, of every race and every /?/, and now have God's grace. And we celebrate this feast for two reasons. The first reason. We celebrate because the spirit of Christ is not tied [down]. The spirit of Christ can take root--make roots--in any culture, with any race, in any place. And we have the proof in the feast. The second reason for celebrating the feast is that all our saints, that have already preceded us, give us a sign of the path. They indicate to us which is the path that has taken them to the place they now occupy, which is to be near to God. We celebrate it because they have shown us--they have given us a vision of what can be a better world, a better life for our sons, for our daughters, for our brothers and sisters. What is this vision? I'm going to tell you this story. It is a story of an indigenous town [people].

There was once a tribe. The tribe lived openly on a great mountain. Then, on a certain occasion, the chief of the tribe was at the point of dying, and he sent for his three sons and said to them, "You know what dear ones, as you can see I am an elderly man and will die soon, and I want one of you to take my place as chief of the tribe. But before this comes to be, I want you to go to the sacred

mountain and that you find the most beautiful thing you 32
can see and that you bring it here to my side. The one who 33
finds the best thing, the most beautiful gift, that will be 34
the one who will have the position of chief of the tribe. 35
So the three lads left. And after several days they 36
returned. The first arrived bringing a flower. This flower 37
only grew, it can be said at the apex, at the peak of the-- 38
it can be said at the summit of the mountain. It was an 39
exotic flower, very rare, but very beautiful. He then gave 40
it to his father. The second son arrivED and brought him a 41
rock with infinite colors, polished, soft, that throughout 42
the years--throughout thousands of years thanks to the 43
wind and thanks to the rain--had acquired this form. And 44
then the third son arrives and arrives empty-handed 45
and he says to the dad "Dad I did not bring you anything 46
but when I was at the summit of the mountain I 47
was able to see how on the other side there was beautiful 48
land, full of green grasses, full of a marvelous lake-- 49
crystalline--and at this moment I had a vision: this must be50
the place for our tribe to lead a better life. And I was 51
so absorbed thinking this idea--so absorbed in how this 52
vision was going to be--that I forgot to bring you any 53
object. I completely forgot about everything." And the 54
dad says to him, " Well, my son, you have brought the 55
best--the most marvelous object, the most beautiful object, 56
and that is the vision for a better future for your 57
brothers and sisters."

And this is what the day of All Saints offers us. A vision of a 58
better future and world where you can live more happily, 59
where there is a world of justice, of peace, and of love. We are 60
talking of so many like Martin Luther King. We are talking of 61
so many like Oscar Romero in El Salvador. We are talking of 62
so many like John F. Kennedy. We are talking of so many 63
like these nuns whom they have just assassinated in Africa. 64
And not only them but rather we talk of all who are here-- 65

testimony-- brothers and sisters, little ones, humble ones, who work at the office, who go to school, but who have this vision of a better world. My brothers, the bridge still exists, the fountain has not yet dried up--the path that the saints show us still exists, the bridge is still available. For just like the saints, we also have to follow the vision that they show us.

I would like to ask you, might there be a saint among you? How do you see [How does it strike you]? Yes or no? Might we have to look for him with a magnifying glass? (Pulls out a magnifying glass from under his garments and looks through it at the people sitting around him. Laughter.) I don't know. A little saint [female] here? A not very saintly little saint [male]? Might there be a saint among us? Of course there is brothers. because I know--What is the sainthood? We asked /?/, and he said "Well, the sainthood is God, the sainthood is Christ, but the sainthood is also participating in this saintliness that they have." The sainthood doesn't mean that you're going to be on your knees the whole day at the temple; that you're going to be at the temple the whole day. The sainthood does not mean that you're going to take a whip or a rope and you're going to hit your back as penitence. The sainthood means making miracles. What does the sainthood mean? The sainthood means that you give faith many times. The sainthood means that you can sin, that you are a person who tends to sin. But the sainthood means that you can say "Lord I have sinned a thousand times, but thanks to you I have risen a thousand and one times." The sainthood does not mean that you will never fall, but instead it means that you **CAN, that** you **WANT**, to share that vision that all the saints present to us. And it is the vision of where there is a better world; a world without so much violence; a world where there is justice and not so many gangs; a world where there doesn't exist too much machismo. This is the vision that the saints present to us on this occasion, the vision of a better world.

Nov. 1, 1992
Sta. *****
Sacerdote "Antonio"

Nosotros llegamos a la fiesta de Todos Santos. En esta fiesTA, como ya escucharon en la primera lectura, recordamos a todas aquellas personas, atravez de todas las edades, atravez de todos los tiempos, todas aquellas personas que son los Santos de Dios. Y que han pasado la gran persecucion, dice la primera lectura, y que han lavado sus ropas blancas con la sangre de Cristo, y que ahora tiene sentados a su diestra. Celebramos esta fiesTA porque--como dice la primera lectura-- "Son tantos que nadie los puede contar." INfinidad, millones de personas de toda raza, Blancos, Negros, Hispanos, Asiáticos, de toda raza toda /?/, y ahora tienen la gracia de Dios. Y celebramos esta fiesta por dos motivos. El primer motivo, celebramos porque el espíritu de Cristo no esta amarrado. El espíritu de Cristo puede tomar raices--hacer raices con cualquier cultura, con cualquier raza, en cualquier lugar. Y la prueba la tenemos en esta fiesta. El segundo motivo para celebrar esta fiesta es porque todos nuestros Santos, que ya nos han precidido, nos dan muestra del camino; nos indican cúal es el camino que a ellos les ha llevado hacia el lugar que ocupan ahora, que es estar cerca de Dios. La celebramos porque ellos nos han mostrado--nos han dado-- una visión de lo que puede ser un mundo mejor, una vida mejor para nuestros hijos, para nuestras hijas, para nuestros hermanos y nuestras hermanas. Cual es esta visión? Voy a contarles esta historia. Es una historia de un pueblo indígena.

Había cierta vez una tribu. La tribu vivía abiertamente en inmensa montaña. Entonces, en cierta ocación, el jefe de la tribu estaba a punto de morir, y mando llamar a sus tres hijos y les dijo, "Saben qué queridos, como ustedes pueden ver yo ya soy un hombre anciano y pronto voy a morir, y quiero que uno de ustedes ocupe mi lugar como jefe de la tribu. Pero, antes de que esto acontesca, quiero que vayan a la montaña santa y que encuentren la cosa más bella que ustedes puedan

ver y me la traigan aquí a mi lado. El que encuentre 33
la cosa mejor, el obsequio mas bello, ese va a ser 34
el que va a ocupar el puesto como jefe de la tribu. 35
Pues se fueron los tres muchachos. Y ya despues devarios días 36
regresaron. LLegó el primero trayendo una flor. Esta flor 37
solo crecia, se puede decir en el culmen en la punta de lo-- 38
se puede decir en la cima de esta montaña. Era una flor 39
exotica, muy rara, pero bellisima. Entoces se la entregó 40
a su padre. LLegO el segundo hijo y le trajo una 41
roca con infinidad de colores, pulida, suavesita, que atraves 42
de los años--atraves de miles de años gracias al 43
viento y gracias a la lluvia--había adquirido esta forma. Y 44
despues llega el tercer hijo y llega con las manos vacías y le 45
dice al papá "Papá no te traje nada 46
pero cuando estava en la cima de la montaña 47
veía como del otro lado había tierra hermosa, 48
llena de pastos verdes, llena de un lago maravilloso-- 49
cristalino--y en este momento tuve una visión: este debe ser 50
el lugar para que nuestra tribu viva una vida mejor. Y estaba tan 51
absorvido pensando en esta idéa--tan absorvido de como iba ser 52
esta visión--que me olvide de traerte cualquier 53
objeto. Me olvide completamente de todo." Y el 54
papá le dice,"Bueno, hijo mio, tú has traido la 55
mejor--el objeto más maravilloso, el objeto más hermoso, 56
y este es la visión para un futuro mejor para tus hermanos y hermanas." 57

Y esto es lo que nos ofrece hoy el día de Todos Santos. Una visión de un 58
futuro y un mundo mejor donde puedamos [sic] vivir más felices, 59
donde hay un mundo de justicia, de paz, y de amor. Estamos 60
hablando de tantos como Martin Luther King. Estamos hablando de 61
tantos como Oscar Romero en El Salvador. Estamos hablando de 62
tantos como John F. Kennedy. Estamos hablando de tantos 63
como estas monjas que acaban de asesinar en Africa. 64
Y no solamente ellos sino hablamos de todos aquí estan-- 65
testimonio--hermanos y hermanas, pequeñitos, humildes, que 66

trabajan el la oficina, que van a la escuela, pero que tienen esta visión de un mundo mejor. Mis hermanos, el puente todavía existe; la fuente no se ha secado aún--aún existe este camino que nos muestran los Santos, aún esta el puente disponible. Pues al igual que los Santos, nosotros tambien tenemos que seguir la visión que nos muestran ellos.

Yo quisiera preguntarles: Habrá un santo entre ustedes? Como ven? Sí o no? Habrá que buscarlo con una lupa? (Saca una lupa de su vestimenta y mira atraves de ella a la gente que lo rodea. Risas.) No sé. Una santita por aquí? Un santito no muy santito? Habra un santo en medio de nosotros? Claro que sí lo hay hermanos. Porque sé--Qué es la santidad? Le preguntamos a /?/, y dijo, "Bueno, la santidad es Dios, la santidad es Cristo, pero la santidad tambien es participar de esta santidad que tienen ellos." La santidad no significa que vas a estar de rodillas todo el día en el templo; que te la vas a pasar todo el día en el templo. La santidad no significa que vas a agarrar un mecate o una reata y te vas a pegar en la espalda para hacer penitencia. La santidad significa hacer milagros. Qué significa la santidad? La santidad significa de que das fé muchas vecez. La santidad significa que puedes pecar, que eres una persona que está propensa a pecar. Pero la santidad significa que puedes decir tú: "Señor he pecado mil vecez, pero gracias a ti me he levantado mil y una vez." La santidad no significa que nunca vas a caer sino significa que PUEdes, significa que QUIEres, compartir esa visión que nos presentan todos los santos. Y es la visión donde hay un mundo mejor, un mundo sin tanta violencia; un mundo donde hay justicia y no tantas gangas; un mundo donde no existe mucho el machismo. Esta es la visión que nos presentan los santos esta ocasión, la visión de un mundo mejor.

Sept. 27, 1992
Our ***** Church
Priest "Jorge"

I want to offer, for you and for me, a small reflection about this word that we have heard. The three lectures address the **SA**me theme. And this theme is about what eight days ago, we were able to reflect in this way, profound and clear. The wealth. The rich man. The man who **LI**ves securely. That is what we reflected on eight days ago. Today the Lord repeats it to us. The prophet Aaron also. I like the way the gospel begins by saying "There was once **A** man. **ONE**. Today, there are many /?/. Today there are many, and it tells it to us very **CLEARLY** the document of Puebla each day the **WEAL**thy are **MORE** at the expense of the poor. Each day.

That is why Christ in the segment says "There was a man who dressed himself **VERY** well, who ate **VERY** well, who got drunk **VERY** well, and that wasted the fortune--**HIS** fortune, because that is how he thought--in front of the poor, and that is a sin. To waste in front of the poor is sin. The pope Paul VI clearly said "It is not permitted to anyone to enjoy [please] their body when many people are dying of hunger." Nobody has the right to have **MORE**. We should all have what is necessary to live. And this is precisely brothers what puzzles me. Because I imagine that more than one of you has dreamed sometime of being rich. There are many people who come to the United States for this reason, because he wants to be rich, because he wants to have money, because he wants to secure his life, because he wants to secure the life of others, because they want to feel glad surrounded by many **THINGS** even though their soul is **EMPTY** of God.

The rich man runs the **RI**sk of making himself slave to money. The rich man, runs the risk of **NEVER** being free. Here, as everywhere else brothers, the rich man, does not enjoy **LIFE SUCH** as the Lord permits. I have had the chance to experience how the people that have money **LIVE LOCKED UP**. They only see the world from their window. They only see the world from their car that goes

by the streets. They only see the world from outside, but never get closer to **TOUCH** to **EXPERIENCE,** to **FEEL** what the real **LIFE** of man is--what truly **IS** the **LIFE** of the human being. A rich man will never be an employee. A rich man will never be a laborer. A rich man will never be a farmer. A rich man will never be that one who goes knocking on doors asking for work. A rich man will never be **HUMBLE**. To **A RICH MAN** it is very difficult to **UNderstand** the poor. **A RICH MAN** doesn't **LISTEN** to the prophet. **A RICH MAN** doesn't **LISTEN** to the priest. A rich man--to a rich man the prophet falls **FAT**ly on him [dislikes him], because he [the rich man] sometimes says "What stones [reprimands] that prophet hurls at us. What stones that priest hurls at us. **HOW HARD** he lets us have it. And it is that the **RICH MAN** is never willing to listen--he only knows how to talk. Here and wherever he has **VOICE AND VOTES** because he has money--because the purse [has the] sounds of something and if it doesn't sound it has bills. And the rich man can do it all. And the rich man feels that all the looks are for him. And the rich man is haughty. And the rich man is a man who lives **FAR** from his brothers. He is a man who doesn't live in community. The rich man leaves the community; he gets out of the community. For him only the special things, the special foods, the uh special orchestras, everything is for the rich. The rich man does not live with the poor. Does not share his life with his brothers--for the rich man it is **VERY DIFFICULT** even to be in a pew sometimes--in the church--**NEXT** to other poor people. And brothers I think that in this celebration **THERE ARE I'm SU**re that there is **ONE**--or more than **ONE**--who are rich. **ÔR** who have made themselves rich but who feel totally EMPTY of God.

There is a priest who writes, **VERY WELL,** about the riches. And titles one of his passages in talking about the /?/ that God laughs about man. Man is born, grows, sets himself to work, looks to have much money. And when he has it, the illnesses begin, the problems begin, and he ends up losing **EVERYTHING** that he has won. And he says this about those who laugh--of Man--of the man that works like this. That is why Saint Paul tells us "Brothers, I that /?/ be men of God." What does it mean to be a man of God?

29-A

It means that you should not only concern yourself with your work--because there are men that know how to work very well, who know how to take their salary home, who make themselves truly **RESPONSIBLE** for their home, who live all their life working, but who forget a lot about God.

And there are women, who are truly working women. Who have their house clean, who work all day, who don't sit down a moment, who wash, who iron, who knit, who do **ENDless** jobs, but who do not give time to God. And Paul tells us "You have to be **MEN** of God." Not those who only dedicate themselves to work to work and to work, and only to work. **YOU HAVE TO shaRE YOUR LIFE** a bit with the Lord. That's why hopefully bothers, that today upon hearing the word of God we may feel **VERY** troubled because since I have arrived here at your side--which has been eight days-- I have noticed that in all the celebrations the people, the priest goes and greets them. Let not **SOME** of you be--or I also-that we may not be like **EPICURUS**, that we will not even want to stretch out our hand on taking leave here at the door because we may see the other as lower than our own life. I already had an experience of being here with you, and there at the door I have stood to greet and bid goodbye. SOME don't know how to greet, don't know how to take leave, don't know how to say Goodbye. Who knows if it is the wealth, if it's their pride, or haughtiness. Nevertheless that we may learn from this parable to be humble and to share our life with the others.

Sept. 27, 1992
Nuestra ******
Sacerdote "Jorge"

Quiero ofrecer, para ustedes y para mí, una pequena reflexion
cerca de esta palabra que hemos escuchado. Las tres lecturas
bordan un **MIS**mo tema. Y, este tema, es acerca, de lo que
hace ocho días, pudimos reflexionar de esta manera, profunda
y clara. La riqueza. El hombre rico. El hombre que **VI**ve
seguro. Eso es lo que reflexionamos hace ocho dias. Hoy El Señor
nos lo vuelve a repetir. El profeta Aron tambien. Me gusta como
comienza el evangelio diciendo: Habia una vez **UN** hombre. **UNO**. Hoy,
hay muchos /?/. Hoy hay muchos, y nos lo dice **CLARAMENTE**
el documento de Puebla, cada día son **MAS** los **RI**cos, a costa de los
pobres. Cada día.
Por eso Cristo en el segmento dice: Habia un hombre que
se vestia **MUY** bien, que comia **MUY** bien, que se emborrachaba
MUY bien, y que despilfarraba los bienes--**SUS** bienes de **EL**, porque
asi pensaba--delante de los pobres, y eso es un pecado. Derrochar
delante de los pobres es pecado. El Papa Pablo VI decia claramente,
"A **NA**die le esta permitido gozar de su cuerpo cuando mucha gente
se esta muriendo de hambre." Nadie tiene derecho a tener **MAS**.
Todos debemos de tener lo necesario para vivir. Y esto es precisamente
hermanos, lo que a mi me cuestiona. Porque me imagino que mas de uno
de ustedes ha soñado alguna vez con ser rico. Hay mucha gente
que viene a los Estado Unidos por este motivo, porque quiere
ser rico, porque quiere tener dinero, porque quiere tener
segura su vida, porque quiere asegurar la vida de los demás, porque
se quieren sentir contentos rodeados de muchas **CO**sas aunque
su alma este **VACIA** de Dios.

El hombre rico corre el **RIES**go de hacerse esclavo del dinero.
El hombre rico corre el riesgo de **NUNCA** ser libre. Aqui, como
en todas las partes hermanos, el rico, no goza de la **VIDA, TAL y CUAL**
El Señor se la permite. A mi me ha tocado experimentar como la
gente que tiene dinero **VIVE ENCERRADA**. Solamente ve al mundo
desde su ventana. Solamente ve al mundo desde su coche que va

por las calles. Solamente ve al mundo desde fuera, pero jamas se
acerca a **PALPAR**, a **EXPERIMENTAR**, a **SENTIR** lo que realmente
es la **VIDA** del hombre--lo que deveras **ES** la **VIDA** del ser humano. Un
rico jamas sera un empleado. Un rico jamas sera un obrero.
Un rico jamas sera un campesino. Un rico jamas sera ese
que anda tocando a las puertas pidiendo trabajo. Un rico jamas
sera **HUMILDE**. **UN RICO** le es muy dificil **EN**tender a
el pobre. **UN RICO** no **ESCUCHA** al profeta.
UN RICO no **ESCUCHA** al sacerdote. Un rico--a un rico
le cae **GORDO** el profeta, porque a vecez dice,
"Que pedradas nos tira ese profeta
que pedradas nos tira ese sacerdote. **QUE DURO** nos da!
Y es que el **RICO** jamas esta dispuesto a escuchar--
él sola mente sabe hablar. Aqui y dondequiera tiene **VOZ, Y**
VOTOS, porque tiene dinero--porque la bolsa le suena algo
y si no le suena tiene billetes. Y el rico todo lo puede.
Y el rico siente que todas lasiradas son par él. Y
el rico es un soberbio. Y el rico es un hombre que vive **LEJOS**
de sus hermanos; es un hombre que no vive en comunidad. El
rico se va de la comunidad; se sale de la comunidad. Para él
solamente las cosas especiales, las comidas especiales, las eh
orquestras especiales, todo para el rico. El rico no vive con el pobre.
No comparte su vida con sus hermanos--para el rico
es **MUY DIFICIL** hasta estar a vecez en una banca--en la iglesia--
JUNTO a otros pobres.Y hermanos, yo creo que en esta
celebracion **HAY ESTOY SE**guro que hay **UNO**--o más de UNO--
que son ricos. O que se han enriquecido, pero que
se sienten **VACIOS** totalmente de Dios.

Hay un sacerdote que escribe, **MUY BIEN**, acerca de las riquezas.
Y titula uno de sus pasajes diciendo de las /?/ que Dios se rie
del hombre. El hombre nace, crece, se pone a trabajar, busca tener
mucho dinero. Y cuando lo tiene, le comienzan las enfermedades, le
comienzan los problemas, y termina por perder **TODO** lo que ha ganado.
Y dice, esto de los que rien--del **HOM**bre--del hombre que
trabaja asi. Por eso San Pablo nos dice: "Hermanos, yo
que /?/ sean hombres de Dios." Que significa ser hombre de Dios?

Significa que no solamente te entretengas en tu trabajo-- 68
porque hay hombres que saben trabajar muy bien, que 69
saben llevar su salario a casa, que se hacen verdaderamente 70
RESPONSABLES de su hogar, que viven toda su vida trabajando, pero 71
que se olvidan mucho de Dios. 72

Y hay mujeres, que son verdaderamente mujeres de trabajo. Que 73
tienen su casa limpia; que trabajan todo el dia; que no se sientan un 74
momento; que lavan, que planchan, que tejen, que hacen sin **FIN** de 75
trabajos, pero que no le dan tiempo a Dios. Y, Pablo nos dice, "ustedes 76
tienen que ser **HOMBRES** de Dios." No, esos que nadamás se dediquen 77
a trabajar, a trabajar, y a trabajar, y solamente a trabajar. **TIENEN** 78
que compar**TIR SU VIDA** un poco con el Señor. Por eso, ojalá hermanos, 79
que hoy al escuchar la palabra de Dios nos sintamos **MUY** cuestionados 80
porque desde que yo he llegado aqui a su lado--que tiene ocho dias-- 81
me he dado cuenta que en todas las celebraciones la gente, el sacerdote 82
va y les saluda. Que no vayan a ser **ALGUNOS** de ustedes--o yo 83
tambien--que no vayamos a ser como **EPULON**, que ni siquiera 84
queramos [sic] tender la mano al despedirnos aqui en la puerta porque 85
veamos al otro como más abajo que nuestra propia vida. Yo ya tuve 86
una experiencia de estar aqui con ustedes, y alla en la puerta me he 87
parado a saludar y a despedir. **ALGUNOS** no saben saludar, 88
no saben despedirse, no saben decir Adios. 89
Quien sabe si seran las riquezas, si sera su orgullo, o soberbia. 90
Sinembargo que aprendamos de esta parabola ser humildes 91
y a compartir nuestra vida con los demás. 92

Oct. 18, 1992
San ***** Cathedral
San Antonio, Texas
Priest "Carlos"

In our scriptures this morning we find some very heADSTRONG persons. I don't know if you know person that are like this. Yes or no? Perhaps even we ourselves can say that we are HEADstrong persons. That if we want something we will do it. Today we listened to a very pretty story where Moses is found really HEadstrong. A **REALLY** headstrong man that had to raise his hands in prayer so that the army he had could beat the other army. And he knew that if he his--lowered his hands a little, the other army would defeat his army. Then with much determination he had to RAise his hands. A very headstrong person. And he raised his hands until the battle occurred completely. We mus--we have to see that he needed the heLP of other persons--of two of his friends so that they would raise his hands, because he knew that he was getting tired. One headstrong person.

In the gospel we also find one headstrong widOW. Perhaps you know some headstrong widows also. And also a headstrong judge. And she wants to beat him [as in litigation]; she wants something of--of what she deserves, and he does **NOT** want to give it to her. The gospel says that **WITH** prayer, **BECAUSE** of prayer, and enough challenging, she defeated the judge.
My brothers and sisters this morning we draw near to this altar; we draw near to our friends because we know that sometimes we are like the widOW and like Moses, and we are headstrong people. But sometimes we have to see that in our prayer, and hopefully that all of us here can say that we are people that pray--a town [people] that prays--hopefully we can see that our family--and with our friends--we can triumph over what is occurring to us in our lives. We are not alone but rather we have

our friends, we have our family, that can help us, 29
that can raise our hands in prayer, so that we may 30
together defeat the wrongs that exist in our society. 31
Today we arrive at this place in our world like a town [people] 32
that **DOES** suffer; like a town that has many needs; like 33
a town that hopefully also prays amidst all this that is 34
occurring. Hopefully too that we can be a little of Moses 35
and of the widow--in our faith--because sometimes we are 36
headstrong with our religion--but not with our faith, and there is 37
a difference. Hopefully we too can begin to be a headstrong 38
people in our faith--because the gospel says at the end 39
{walks toward the podium and takes the scriptures}: "For I assure 40
you that God will do justice in their favor, and will do it soon." But 41
when the Son of Man comes, will he find faith on the earth? 42
Hopefully we can say that yes **THERE IS** faith on the earth. And 43
that we are part of this tradition of the faith. Hopefully we will be 44
able to say that we **ARE** the faith. Knowing the faith we can share it 45
with our children, our grandchildren and grand-grandchildren. 46
I ask you that this week that in your homes and in your jobs 47
you have a prayer--propose a prayer to our God. 48
A prayer that takes us from his place to another place: to the 49
kingdom of God so that we may be determined person, persons of 50
prayer, and persons of faith. This is your chore for this week. 51

Oct. 18, 1992
San *****
San Antonio, Texas
"Santa Misa" Broadcast by WSNS Channel 44, Chicago
Sacerdote "Carlos"

En nuestras escrituras esta mañana encontramos a unas personas muy caBEZUDAS. No sé si ustedes conocen a personas que son así. Sí o no? Tal vez hasta nosotros mismos podemos decir que somos personas CABEzudas. Que si queremos halgo lo vamos hacer. Hoy escuchamos a una historia muy bonita donde se encuentra Moisés bien CAbezudo. Un hombre **BIEN** cabezudo que tenia que levantar las manos en oración para que el ejercito que él tenia podiera [sic] ganarle al otro ejercito. Y él sabia que si él su--bajaba sus manos un poco, el otro ejercito iba a vencir [sic] al ejercito de él. Tos [sic] con mucha determinación tuvo que ALzar sus manos. Una persona muy cabezuda. Y el alzó las manos hasta que la batalla ocurriera completamente. Debemo--tenemos que ver que él necesitó la AyuDA de otras personas--de dos de sus amigos para que le levantaran las manos porque él sabía que se estaba canzando. Una persona cabezuda.

En el evangelio tambien encontramos a una viuDA cabezuda. Tal vez conocen a unas viudas cabezudas tambien ustedes. Y tambien un juez cabezudo. Y ella quiere ganarle; ella quiere algo de--de lo que ella merece, y él **NO** se lo quiere dar. Dice el evangelio que **CON** la oración, **POR** la oración, y retando bastante, ella venció al juez. Mis hermanos y hermanas, esta mañana nos arrimamos a este altar; nos arrimamos a nuestros amigos porque sabemos que nosotros a vecez sí somos como la viuDA y como Moisés, y somos gente cabezuda. Pero avecez tenemos que ver que en nuestra oración, y ojalá que todos aquí podamos decir que somos gente que reza--UN pueblo que reza--ojalá podemos ver que nuestra familia--y con nuestros amigos--nosotros podemos triunfar sobre lo que nos está ocurriendo en nuestras vidas. No estamos solos sino tenemos nuestros amigos, tenemos nuestra familia, que nos pueden ayudar, que nos pueden alzar las manos en oración, para que

podamos juntos vencer lo malo que existe en nuestra sociedad. 31
Hoy llegamos a este lugar en nuestro mundo como un pueblo 32
que **SI** sufre; como un pueblo que tiene muchas necesidades; como 33
un pueblo que ojalá tambien reza entre todo esto de lo que esta 34
occurriendo. Ojalá que tambien nosotros podamos ser un poco 35
de Moisés y de la viuda--en nuestra fé--porque a veces sí somo 36
cabezudos con nuestra religión--pero no con nuestra fé, y hay 37
una diferencia. Ojalá tambien nosotros podamos empezar a ser una 38
gente cabezuda en nuestra fé--porque dice el evangelio al final 39
{camina hacia el podio y toma las escrituras}: "Pues les aseguro que 40
Dios hará justicia en favor de ellos, y lo hará pronto." Pero cuando 41
el Hijo del Hombre venga, hayará fé en la tierra? Ojalá que nosotros 42
podemos [sic] decir que sí **HAY** fé en la tierra. Y que nosotros, 43
somos parte de esta tradición de la fé. Ojalá que nosotros podamos 44
decir que nosotros **SO**mos la fé. Conociendo la fé nosotros podemos 45
compartir la fé con nuestros hijos, con nuestros nietos y bisnietos. 46
Les pido que esta semana que en sus hogares y en sus trabajos 47
ustedes tengan una oración--propongan una oración a nuestro Dios. 48
Una oración que nos lleve de este lugar a otro lugar: al reino de 49
Dios para que nostros podamos ser personas determinadas, personas 50
de oración, y personas de fé. Esta es su tarea para esta semana. 51